THEOLOGY

VOL. LI FEBRUARY, 1948 No. 332

Editorial

ON returning to my place, I want first to thank Professor Sykes for enabling me to be absent, not only for so long, but also with entire freedom from anxiety about what might be happening to THEOLOGY. It was particularly good of him to undertake the editorial responsibilities, since my absence coincided with a period in the academic year when pressure upon him must be very heavy.

I need hardly say that I had an intensely interesting time in the U.S.A. and met with wonderful kindness everywhere. I was also encouraged to learn how widely THEOLOGY is read there, and our contributors ought to know that what they write is much appreciated. It has been suggested that I should give here some account of my experiences, but I should hardly know where to begin or end, and I am still engaged in trying to reduce to some kind of order the turmoil of impressions that I received. The editor of *Christianity and Crisis* did, it is true, catch me at a favourable, or rather unfavourable, moment and persuade me to set down some impressions of religion in America, and I reproduce below the reckless result of his invitation.

I will add at present a few notes, and perhaps return to the subject next month.

I had gathered, though I cannot say when or where, that the Americans were eating extravagantly and wasting food outrageously, but in point of fact they eat very moderately and I saw no signs at all of the reputed wastefulness. I do not say that this moderation is a pure exercise in the virtue of temperance, for the fantastic prices of food are certainly conducive to it. I wish to testify that nearly everywhere I went I came across moving evidence of practical sympathy with European hardships and of eagerness to help in every way possible. Americans are constantly despatching food parcels, and by English standards their cost is exorbitant.

On the other hand, I found that otherwise well-informed Americans have the wildest ideas about the present regime in Britain. The American press seems to be chiefly responsible for this, with its inability to distinguish anything between totalitarian communism and *laissez-faire* capitalism. It is as if they took seriously and actually believed what Mr Churchill says about the Labour Government in his most irresponsible and histrionic moments.

As for America itself, or what I saw of it, it struck me as a mass of paradoxes, and if I had seen more the impression would surely have been heightened. What a jumble it is of beauty and ugliness, of idealism and materialism, of dollar worship and delightful generosity, of consummate pride and childlike simplicity, of vitality and decadence!

Read John Gunther's *Inside U.S.A.*, and you will find these and other paradoxes documented with a fascinating wealth of detail. Remarkable at present is the extraordinary combination of public optimism with private pessimism. Officially the gospel of progress and all that went with it is still taken for granted, and indeed is asserted with a naive confidence, which a European is at first tempted to suppose must be a leg-pull. But it is nothing so sophisticated as that. Beneath the optimism, however, to which the American scene by itself affords every encouragement, is a widespread anxiety and perhaps despair. To some extent the cleavage is between the old and the young, but it is more complicated than that. Almost everyone in private talks about the next war as inevitable, and then the suspicion everywhere of communists within the gates is positively pathological.

There is a situation here to which, you would think, the pulpit could speak with effect. You might expect that it would be taking hold of these paradoxes and making something of them. But that is just what it does not appear to be doing. The American pulpit—of course, I am generalizing—seems to be an institution from which the note of paradox is deliberately excluded. "What about Reinhold Niebuhr?" do you say? I had heard years ago that he was wielding much more influence in Britain than in America, and, at any rate so far as the pulpit goes, that is still the case. Again, we get quite a false impression if we suppose that *Theology To-day* is representative of contemporary American theology. I hardly expected to find that it was, but I did expect to find that what it represents had made more impact than it has done yet. However, very unexpected things may be about to happen in America, as elsewhere.

The Appalling Religiousness of America

An invitation to one who is visiting the United States for the first time, and who has been here for only about two months, to give his impressions of religion in America is an invitation to him to make a fool of himself, though I acquit the editor of having that design upon me. I have been no farther West than Chicago, and no farther South than Washington, D.C. I know that there are vast areas not only of American territory but of American life and religion of which I have seen nothing, though I have been told much about them, enough to warn me that any generalization about this variegated and complex scene must be risky. Moreover, although as I have travelled about I seem to have seen an immense amount in a short time, yet I have been located chiefly in colleges and seminaries and in church circles. It is true that I have learned a considerable amount about other aspects of American life, and have been present both at the World Series[1] and at a banquet of industrialists! Still, my impressions are bound to be partial and

[1] *Note for English readers.* The World Series is the culmination of the baseball season, and means much more to the U.S.A. than the Cup Final and the Boat Race combined mean to England.

superficial; I have myself come across many exceptions to what I am going to say, and I can myself think of many ways in which my observations might be qualified. But while I am making a fool of myself, I may as well do so boldly. Nor will I occupy space in saying how uniformly charming and hospitable I have found Americans to be. Not the least engaging of your characteristics is your eagerness to hear yourselves candidly criticized.

Religion versus God.—The first thing that has struck me is that America is now much more religious than Britain. People here go to church much more, and I am told that church attendance has tended to increase since the end of the war. Your churches appear to be flourishing institutions, and they strike me, even if they do not strike you, as fabulously opulent. Our churches in Britain, on the other hand, are all more or less impoverished and tottering, and are on the verge of economic bankruptcy. At first sight the comparative prosperity of religion in America is calculated to hearten and gratify a visiting clergyman or to make him envious. But on second thoughts I find it curiously depressing.

It reminds me of the prodigious religiousness of Britain in the nineteenth century, the aftermath of which I can myself remember in the days of my childhood before 1914. That religiousness, all that business and efficiency in organizing religious services and activities, served, I am sure, as a cushion against the hard impact of the living God. Our churches were like comfortable and well-managed religious clubs, in which we felt nicely at home, in which we felt good, in which we even wanted to be better, at least on Sunday evenings when singing particularly lush hymns. Although you do not go to church on Sunday evenings, your churches remind me of all that.

In Britain this religious efficiency and prosperity is being dissolved, where it has not already been dissolved, but out of the dissolution or in the midst of it the voice of the living God is beginning to be heard again, scaring and confounding us and making us feel most uncomfortable. As the cushion of religion, with which we were able to keep God at a respectable distance, collapses, we are beginning to turn to our Bibles in quite a fresh frame of mind, and its mighty words about the majesty and the wrath and the mercy of God, which in the old days of security we had got pleasantly muffled, are piercing us with their terror and their glory. Thus in Britain, while our churches are metaphorically if not literally falling into ruin, the disturbing and restoring presence of the living God is becoming an experienced reality amid the ruins. Here in the U.S.A., it seems to me, the cushion of religious efficiency and prosperity is still doing its comfortable, but fatal, work. I can only record this impression. It is not for me to say what those of you who are aware of this condition, as I know some of you are, can do about it. In the end, this is a matter wherein we have in agony to beseech God to show us what *He* is going to do about it.

Sect versus Church.—The second thing that has struck me is your sectarianism. Observe that I say your sectarianism, not your sects, about which I knew plenty before I came here, more than I have been able to see since I came. Moreover, the old distinction between a

church and a sect is now much confused everywhere. There are great churches which are riddled with sectarianism, and there are little sects which have the outlook and the accent of a great church. Nor do I wish to suggest that we are free from sectarianism in Britain. Far from it. But here it seems to be carried to its logical limit and to become fully explicit. And I will confess that it strikes me as a very horrid thing. The fact that you have so many churches and sects is, I realize, due in the first instance to the variety in the forms of Christianity which emigrants from Europe brought with them. I am not saying that Americans are to be blamed either for this original circumstance or for its present-day consequences.

What surprises and shocks me is your apparent blindness to the flat contradiction between a collection or even a federation of sects and the fundamental idea of Christ's Church. I attribute this blindness to your familiarity with, and necessary acquiescence in, this babel of church sects. Your churches, despite the splendid and universal professions which they may enshrine in their creeds or formularies, seem complacently to regard it as their task to cater for the religious needs of such individuals or such sections of the population as will patronize them. I see no body (certainly not the large but Rome-dominated and exclusive popish sect) standing forth and bearing witness that the work of Christ in every land is to bind men together in one universal family or kingdom without regard to their different racial origins, trades and professions, income brackets, class interests, political parties, etc.

I find that the word "parish" is used here to denote, not a territorial area and all the people in it, but a gathered congregation; and this is significant. The true idea of a parish church is that it claims all the people dwelling in a particular urban or rural area as citizens of the kingdom of Christ, just as a National Church[1] makes the same claim upon all the members of a nation, whether or not they themselves confess Christ as their King.

In England and Scotland we still have parishes and National Churches in this sense, although the Church of England and the Church of Scotland differ in their forms of government and in their relation to the State, although neither has the active allegiance of more than a minority of the population, and although both are accompanied by dissenting sects which they rightly acknowledge to be churches as well as sects. Dreadfully as our Christian and ecclesiastical condition has deteriorated, witness is still borne in our land to the great idea of an inclusive National Church, and the day is perhaps much nearer than any of us realize when the sectarianism which has infected our churches as well as our sects will be transcended in a united Church which will be able to embrace within one body all confessing Christians.

[1] By a National Church I do not mean a State Church or an Established Church. I do not mean the old pre-toleration type of National Church which was involved in the attempts of civil governments to enforce religious uniformity upon their subjects. I mean a Church which realizes its responsibility to God for the whole people in which it is set, in particular its responsibility for binding them into unity on the ground of their membership in Christ's universal body.

What surprises and shocks me here is not that the U.S.A. recognizes no National Church—for I can perfectly well see that this is not a present possibility—but that the principle of a National Church in all its bearings seems never to have occurred to American Christians as a fundamental criterion which explains your ecclesiastical diseases. You seem to have no higher notion of church union than a federation of sects. I shall be happy to learn that I am mistaken about this.

Law versus Gospel.—But what shocks me most of all is the character of the preaching that seems to prevail in your churches, though here at least I know that there are notable exceptions. So far as I can ascertain, the paradigm of American preaching is: "Let me suggest that you try to be good." Moralistic homilies are still the order of the day. They are delivered, no doubt, with various degrees of eloquence, and they may recommend various degrees and forms of virtue or of piety. There may even be such preachers with fire in their bellies, though I have not come across them.

Preachers take texts from Scripture (though they do not always do that much), and treat them as mottoes or captions under which they excogitate some religious or moral lessons that have little, if any, direct relation to the Scripture they have quoted. Who preaches sermons that are genuine expositions of the text and sense of Scripture, bringing to bear the great Biblical themes of God's judgment and mercy upon men who are dead in their complacency, self-confidence, or pride? Your preachers, it seems to me, are still advocating justification by good works of one kind or another (they may be very orthodox or very "Catholic" good works); they are not proclaiming the Gospel of salvation by faith in Jesus Christ. They are not exposing the basic human predicament—namely, that the attempt to justify ourselves by good works inflates our pride so that our progress in health turns into a worse disease. This predicament being unrealized, there is blindness to the starting-point of the Gospel of the New Covenant. You are still preaching the Law, and a pretty easygoing or romantic Law at that.

These are, I hope you will believe, the faithful wounds of a friend, who speaks not out of strength but out of weakness, and who also has Pelagianism in his blood, but who by the mercy of God has been brought to see it for what it is.

A. R. Vidler.

The Prospects and Principles of Prayer Book Revision—II

PRINCIPLES

1. First and foremost among the principles to be observed in the work of revision is the necessity of conforming worship to faith. *Lex orandi lex credendi.* Anglican liturgical worship must be based upon theological truth approved by Anglican standards. What, then, is the mind of the Church of England as to the determination of the content of revealed truth?

"At the time of the Reformation," writes Boulgakov (*The Orthodox Church*, pp. 20*f.*), "the Western Church tried to oppose Scripture to tradition; really no such opposition exists; the idea of such antagonism was produced artificially by conflicting desires, either to lessen the value of Scripture in behalf of tradition, or the reverse. Scripture and tradition belong to the life of the Church moved by the same Holy Spirit, which operates in the Church, manifesting itself in tradition and inspiring sacred writers." That is a necessary warning against the out-of-hand rejection of all tradition as merely man-made, in favour of the Scriptures as wholly Spirit-made: but it does not help when a contradiction is seen or suspected between tradition and Scripture. That problem had to be dealt with in the sixteenth century, and the Church of England then determined that a regulative function must be ascribed to the Scriptures when it is necessary to pass judgment on traditions.

This was no novelty, but a return to the position taken by the early Church. When once the canon of the Scriptures had been fixed, the conservative restraint on tradition was made "much more precise and effective," as Bishop Gore pointed out (*A New Commentary*, pp. 15 *f.*). "Whatever doctrinal question was raised, the supreme court of reference was henceforth what a bishop at a council in Carthage (A.D. 256) called 'the holy and adorable words of the Scriptures.' " Recovering and endorsing this principle, the Church of England declared uncompromisingly that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith." Here is no ruling out of tradition in general, but only of such traditions as are contradictory to the Scriptures or incapable of being satisfactorily deduced from them or related to them by legitimate interpretation. Any revision of the Prayer Book must conform strictly to this position, even though it may involve some members of the Church in what seems to them to be a self-denying ordinance in respect of certain matters which are accepted by the Church of Rome or by the Holy Orthodox Church, or by both of them. Canon Lacey once argued for a larger inclusion of tradition in the formulation of Anglican teaching (*Authority in the Church*, p. 27), but he added significantly, "The self-denying ordinance may nevertheless be an excellent rule for any particular Church."

To abandon now the very strong position which has been held by our Church for the past four hundred years would mean setting out on a road which seems to most English churchmen to diverge dangerously from the true line of march. Boulgakov reminds us (*op. cit.*, p. 40) that "by means of the Church's services certain dogmas of Christian doctrine which have not been declared by the definitions of the œcumenical councils acquire the force of law. For example: reverence of the Mother of God in Orthodoxy, the doctrine of the Seven Sacraments, the cult of holy images and relics, the teachings about the future life, many things which liturgical tradition suggests for our acceptance, in a manner sometimes more powerful than conciliar decision." To which the Church of England would doubtless

reply, in the words of Bishop Gore (*op. cit.*, p. 17), "Though pious opinions which are not articles of faith are not to be despised, those who teach in the Church's name must not insist upon them or burden the conscience of men with them, as if they were." There could be no surer way of providing that such things shall be insisted on than by including them in the Book of Common Prayer.

But this acceptance of the Scriptures as the ultimate criterion of the content of saving doctrine leads to a further question—namely, On what particular understanding of the nature of the inspiration of the Bible is the Church's corpus of theology to be constructed? For the answer to this question must determine both the theological foundation of the Book of Common Prayer and also the extent of the provision to be made for the systematic reading of the Scriptures in the course of the Church's worship. What is the present estimate of the relation between the two Testaments, and of the relative values of the various books which they include? Have all an equal authority? and, if not, what part is played by the less important of them? The 1549 and 1871 lectionaries, for example, rested upon the traditional view, as do the contents of the Prayer Book generally, while the 1922 lectionary is based upon the critical view. Now, however, the traditional and the critical views are being superseded by what may be called the neo-traditional view. According to this the whole Bible is to be received as a unity, telling in a single story the long process of divine self-revelation and action, of which it is itself a part; and each book is to be accepted as having its own distinctive and contributory message, the value of which may be greater or smaller by comparison with the others. This would seem to justify our practice of reading the whole of the Scriptures in the course of the daily office, with the qualification that we should in future refuse to cloud the distinctive messages of the various books by the introduction of the methods of historical and literary criticism; but over against that it would require that the Prayer Book should declare New Testament standards in all its rites, and subordinate its whole use of the Old Testament to this overriding principle.

Here the psalter presents a special problem. While the psalms were sung in verse, doggerel though much of it was, they were immensely popular. But true hymnody has long since displaced that form of psalmody in our Church; and the return to the sole use of the Old Testament text, complete and unrevised, has put the psalms very much out of favour, for two reasons. First, there is a strain upon Christian devotion. It is one thing to listen to the reading of Old Testament lessons as inspired records of pre-Christian history, and quite another to recite or sing Old Testament songs instinct with pre-Christian hopes and aspirations as a mode of expressing Christian faith and worship. Again and again there is a realized gap between the two, which few are capable of bridging by the methods of Messianic, corporate, and mystical interpretation. Second, the use of Coverdale's version, which was not made for the purpose of chanting, is a stumbling-block even to choirs, and is often obscure and tedious to the congregation. The result is a marked tendency on the part of

the clergy to reduce the element of psalmody to small proportions and to confine themselves to a limited choice of psalms, on which the changes are rung. The time is ripe for the Church to make a thorough revision of Coverdale's work, adapting it to liturgical use by correcting errors, removing obscurities and maledictions, rearranging verses with an eye to the requirements of the Anglican chant, and analysing the psalms into stanzas and sections so as to indicate their changing themes.

2. The second principle to be observed in the work of revision is that "all the whole Church of England shall have but one Use." This is the truly catholic way of liturgy, and it is the special need of our Church today in the matter of worship. When the task of revision is undertaken, the goal should be a single Book of Common Prayer, which shall be taken into use on an appointed day, and shall thenceforth entirely supersede both 1662 and 1928. The provision of permissible alternative rites would be a complete break with our past practice, would register the existence of irreconcilable parties within the Church, would encourage and perpetuate their existence, and would provide reasonable ground for further claims to be advanced from time to time by disaffected parties.

As in the autocephalous churches of the Holy Orthodox Church there are diverse uses to be found, so too there are various uses in the constituent parts of the Anglican Communion. National Churches have the right of self-determination in the matter within the limits of catholic order and historic and existing associations. But the unity of any National Church should find expression and safeguard in the use of a common rite. Not only so: but there is great gain to the whole body of the faithful when a single Prayer Book carries with it a guarantee that in all places where they may have occasion to present themselves in order to share in the Church's appointed worship the accustomed order will be found. Variation in practice will appear in respect of the frequency with which some parts of the rite are used, in respect of the fullness or restraint of the accompanying ceremonial, and in respect of the relative proportions of saying and singing; and there will be considerable differences in the degree to which the liturgical rite is supplemented by the provision of non-liturgical services. But a single Prayer Book rite should prescribe the corporate action of the whole Church of England, to be presented by many or by few, with the splendour and dignity possible to a great cathedral church in an ancient city, or with the humbler resources of a small church in the heart of the country.

3. The third principle concerns the arrangement of the contents of the book. It is that regard should be had to the Church's intention in the ordering of its whole scheme of worship, so that priorities receive due prominence; that there should be accord with the progressive stages of the Christian life; and that in general the convenience of those who are to use the book should be carefully considered.

It cannot be doubted that by setting Morning and Evening Prayer in the forefront the Book of Common Prayer has given to the daily office a mistaken pre-eminence in the minds of many Anglicans; while the position of the Litany suggests that it is a sequel to Morning

Prayer and militates against its proper use as a preface to the Eucharist. It would be far better to set the gospel sacraments first, and so to deliver the baptismal services from the depreciation of being tucked away in small type with a number of occasional rites, and to give proper emphasis to the sacramental beginning of the Christian life. The Catechism and the Order of Confirmation would follow; and then the Eucharistic Liturgy, preceded by the Litany. After the Collects, Epistles and Gospels the daily office could find place; and then the various occasional rites, from the Ministry of Reconciliation to the Burial of the Dead; and finally the Ordinal. The Psalter and the Lectionary would form a supplement to the book. The position of the Preface to the Ordinal has left many churchpeople unaware of its very existence; and it would be of great advantage to carry it to the beginning of the book, with a number of other important matters such as the ornaments rubric, and thus to provide a general introductory section, displacing the existing miscellany with some well-ordered instruction necessary for all users of the book.

The general layout of the contents and the use of typographical aid might be made to assist greatly in promoting the understanding use of the book. And careful consideration should be given to the suggestion that the printers should adopt a uniform system of pagination for all sizes and editions of the complete Prayer Book.

4. Fourthly, the diction and style of the new book must conform to the high standard of the present book, so far as that can be contrived; but at the same time all should be made intelligible to the general body of worshippers so far as language can avail in dealing with ultimate mysteries. It has to be recognized, however, that the very nature of liturgical worship and sacramental usage, based as it is upon exact theological statement of the great Christian dogmas, excludes the possibility of so simplifying the language of the Prayer Book as to make everything completely intelligible to the meanest mind.

The chief problem that arises under this head results from the necessary addition of some new material to much that is old. It will have to be decided whether the new is to be made to resemble the old, for the sake of literary unity, by writing it in pseudo-Cranmerian English, or whether the old is to be modernized into conformity with the new. It is hardly conceivable that much support should be found for either pseudo-Cranmerian English in the new parts of the revised book or modernized Cranmerian English in the old. The old and the new will probably have to be set in juxtaposition, with no attempt to reconcile them in a strictly uniform style, but with due care that all that is new shall be presented in the worthiest form of modern English and not in the purely contemporary idiom. The new book will thus bear some of the marks of our changing literary standards; but as a Prayer Book it need be none the worse for the fact that "hath" and "doth" rub shoulders with "has" and "does," to instance two of the most elementary discrepancies that will occur.

A further principle which may be introduced in this connexion, because its application would lighten the weight of some of the most characteristic Cranmerian passages, is that the value of exhortation,

when it is intruded within the ordered setting of a corporate act of worship, is in inverse proportion to its length. Sustained worship is assisted by brief and repeated encouragement, as in the case of the words "Let us pray"; but the use of lengthy forms of appeal and instruction is apt to promote self-consciousness in the worshippers, to direct attention to the business of edification, and so to render the worship discontinuous and less concentrated. This does not apply to the reading of the Scriptures, which is both worshipful in character and also a divine stimulus to worship; but it does apply to preaching, which is in place before or after an office, and equally in place between the liturgy of the catechumens and the liturgy of the faithful in the eucharistic liturgy, but sadly out of place where it is made to break up the unity of an office. It is notorious that this was commonly overlooked until recent years in the administration of confirmation.

It is therefore desirable to prune with some severity the longer hortatory passages which are found in the Prayer Book, passages which are peculiarly characteristic of Reformation service books. There will be a natural reluctance in some quarters to part with familiar exhortations couched in noble language; but some of these should be dispensed with altogether, and the rest should be considerably reduced in length.

5. The fifth principle to be observed is that elements of worship and sacramental administration which were deliberately abandoned or obscured, in the interests of truth and of a return to simplicity of form, because they were judged to be dangerously associated with corrupt doctrines or to be merely superfluous, may legitimately be restored when a sufficient lapse of time has broken the tradition of abuse and largely dispelled the reactionary prejudice which they provoked. Thus there are very many today who hold, with Bishop Henson, that "treasures of ancient piety were lost in the storms of the Reformation," and would warmly support Bishop Frere's suggestion that "some things were done in the Reformation period which we might well undo now."

Cranmer decided against "Anthems, Responds, Invitatories, and such like things as did break the continual course of the reading of the Scriptures." In so doing he was led to make a wholesale rejection of forms of remarkable beauty, fashioned with great skill out of the Scriptures themselves, and of considerable value in marking the changing seasons and days of the Church's year with a pleasing variety of use. Something of what Cranmer thus threw away should certainly be restored.

The reconciliation of penitents by means of the ministry of absolution, though it had been tainted with commercialism, was not ruled out. On the contrary, it was specifically provided for. But the provision made was slight in form, almost as though it was judged to be prudent to leave to the memory of those who would use it a matter which it was necessary to retain but unwise to stress. But memory of the accustomed form can no longer be considered authoritative and sufficient. It is necessary now to provide the form, so that it may be available with authority for the use of all.

In the Order for the Administration of the Holy Communion the

pleading of the one perfect and all-sufficient Sacrifice, which had been grossly conceived by many in terms of the popular misunderstanding of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, was overshadowed and dwarfed by the self-presentation of the worshippers in an act of praise and thanksgiving. A radical reconstruction of the canon is therefore essential, regard being had to the fuller knowledge now available of the eucharistic theology and liturgy of the early Church, and to the suggestions of an Anglican mind in the matter, declared in the revisions already made in other parts of the Anglican Communion.

The reservation of the eucharistic elements is not provided for in the Prayer Book, but is now widely practised, and will have to be recognized and regularized in the revised book, not merely because it is widely practised, but because our Church is largely agreed as to its legitimacy and necessity, though not so largely agreed as to the restriction of its use to the communion of the sick and dying.

The recovery of the sacrament of Holy Unction, not merely for use *in extremis*, but as a part of the Church's regular ministry of healing, has already been effected in practice and covered by authority, and should certainly be provided for in the new book.

So also should prayer for the faithful departed, with the careful restraint of petition that was observed in early days and with a clear line of demarcation between all such prayer and the less surely based practice of invoking the saints.

In the Ordinal the reduction of the *traditio instrumentorum* to the delivery of the Bible was dictated by a desire to strip the act of ordination of all that tended to obscure its essential elements, and, further, to emphasize the stress laid by our Church upon the Scriptures as the criterion of the rule of faith. But the result has been to seem to attach a smaller importance to the ministry of the sacraments than to the ministry of the Word; and the balance might well be restored by the recovery of the tradition of the sacred vessels at the ordination of priests, and of the equally valuable piece of symbolism which consists in the tradition of the pastoral staff at the consecration of bishops. The history of ordination rites is now so well assured that these things are in no danger of obscuring the two essentials of prayer and the laying on of hands.

6. The sixth and last principle is that legitimate needs which have arisen since the age of the Reformation ought now to be provided for by the enlargement of the contents of the book. The Calendar needs some corrections and additions, as in the 1928 book. The whole body of rubrics should be overhauled with a view to the provision of clear and unambiguous direction in the conduct of worship, and supplemented where necessary in order to secure a simple pattern of ceremonial action. Collects, Epistles and Gospels are required for the Lesser Saints' Days and for certain other occasions. The occasional prayers and thanksgivings should be increased so as to meet the needs of the modern age, though not with undue particularity; and a form of bidding prayer should be added to them. And forms should be provided for private baptism in cases of emergency; for the blessing of a couple already married by the State; for a service adaptable to

various occasions of thanksgiving; for a Penitential Service to take the place of the Commination; and for burial services for baptized children and for unbaptized adults and children.

In order to preserve the distinctively liturgical character of the Prayer Book, and in order to prevent it from being overloaded, it would no doubt be generally agreed that Diocesan Service Books should continue to be provided as necessary supplements to the Prayer Book; and, further, that there should be an approved book containing materials for popular forms of service, with full liberty to the clergy to go outside this provision when they so desire. O. HARDMAN.

(*Concluded*)

The Annotations to the Psalms: A New Theory

PROBABLY the great majority of those who read or sing the Psalms in the English language use the "Prayer-Book" version, in which the plain text is given, headed only by the first word or two of the Latin translation, derived from the Vulgate. But both the Authorized and Revised Versions are provided with a number of annotations, the meanings of which have been the subject of inquiry for many centuries, certainly before the dawn of the Christian era. Some of them have evoked the most diverse explanations, especially the term "Selah," which may justly be termed the chief mystery word of the Bible. So great is the interest which is still taken in this magnificent poetry that the clarification of any of its phrases, especially those relating to the occasions of its composition and performance and the manner in which the individual Psalms were recited or sung, is greatly to be desired. It is the opinion of the author that a more definite explanation of these annotations can be given than has hitherto been the case, by straightforward analogy with present-day devotional literature.

Although it is not quite certain that all the Psalms were used in public worship, the Psalter can nevertheless be regarded as the Temple hymn-book, fulfilling very much the same functions as, for example, "Hymns Ancient and Modern" does today. It is therefore quite reasonable to assume that, in spite of the difference of nationality and of date, very much the same requirements would be experienced and equivalent methods would be adopted to meet them. Further, the Psalms still form an integral part of both public and private worship, and, again, similar requirements are met in their use as in the old days of the Second Temple. There is hence good reason to expect that the method of analogy will yield useful information.

Nature of Annotations.—The principal annotations are broadly as follows, in the approximate order in which they usually occur:

1. To (For) the Chief Musician.
2. A statement as to authorship (*e.g.*, a Psalm of David, For the sons of Korah, etc.).
3. The tune to which the Psalm is to be sung (*e.g.*, Upon Shushaneduth—*i.e.*, set to "The Lily of the Testimony").

4. A note on the instrumental accompaniment (*e.g.*, Nechiloth—*i.e.*, with wind instruments).
5. A word descriptive of the Psalm itself (*e.g.*, Song, Prayer, Psalm of praise, Song of degrees (or ascents), etc.).
6. A passage describing the occasion to which the Psalm is supposed to refer.
7. Certain other words, such as Maschil, Michtam, and Shiggaion, which may be descriptive of the text, or give musical instructions.
8. In the body of the Psalm, the word "Selah," reinforced in one instance by "Higgaion."

The first remarkable feature with regard to nearly all the above is the irregularity with which they occur. About one-fifth of the Psalms have no annotations whatever, the exact number being thirty-two. Twenty more are simply headed "A Psalm of David," ten simply "A Song of Degrees," and nine are headed only by an attribution to the Korahites or to Asaph. Slightly over twenty have other plain headings, such as "A Psalm," "Song of Degrees of David" (4), or "of Solomon" (1). But fifty-five are described as "To (For) the Chief Musician," and it is among them that the other captions are almost entirely distributed.

In some cases these notes are so profuse that they almost amount to full-sized introductions. Psalm 18, for example, is prefaced by "To the Chief Musician, A Psalm of David, the Servant of the Lord, who spake unto the Lord the words of this song in the day that the Lord delivered him from the hand of all his enemies, and from the hand of Saul: And he said [Verse 1], I will love Thee, O Lord . . ." Again, Psalm 60 is headed "To the Chief Musician upon Shushan-eduth, Michtam of David, to teach; when he strove with Aram-naharaim and with Aram-zobah, when Joab returned, and smote of Edom in the valley of salt twelve thousand."

Although in these there are words of which the meanings are as yet unknown, it can be stated that terms definitely recognized as musical are practically confined to the "Chief Musician" group, as well as all but five of the "historical" notes and very nearly all the seventy-one occurrences of the word "Selah." It is a highly curious and significant fact that the Hebrew scribes and commentators had lost the meanings of the mystery words, as this indicates an astonishing break in tradition, and urgently requires explanation.

The Chief Musician.—The key phrase would seem to be that relating to the Chief Musician, since so many of the other terms are only found in association therewith; and it forms, therefore, the most promising starting-point. Many commentators have proposed interpretations for it of the most diverse nature. The Hebrew original is "Lamnazeach," and the three chief English translations render it "To the Chief Musician" (Authorized Version), "For the Chief Musician" (Revised Version) and "From the Choirmaster's Collection" (Moffatt). Three eminent international authorities on the Psalms have translated the word as (1) "A Psalter collected under the name of the Director

or Choirmaster" (Briggs), (2) "Re the musical rendering" (Haupt), and (3) "To cause the face of Jehovah to shine" (Mowinckel); while others have added still further to the conflict. Of the above, Moffatt and Briggs are nearly or quite in agreement; but there is no evidence whatever that any musical director formed a collection.

Analysis of Case.—The most likely method of solving the puzzle is to put ourselves as fully as our imagination can contrive in the position of one taking part in the music of the Second Temple, and to make use of our existing experience in the organization of church music of today. We should then realize that the music, which must have been especially elaborate in so important a situation, would undoubtedly be in the hands of a choirmaster or precentor. The most likely annotated version of the Psalms would be his private copy, in which he had made his own notes. It is then only necessary to suppose that one in the long chain of scribes or copyists had used as his original a set of MSS in which some of the constituent Psalms had been those used by, or formerly in possession of, a choirmaster, in order to explain many and possibly all of the points at issue.

There is no difficulty in accounting for the mixture of two (or more) different sets. For example, two badly worn rolls may have been available for the scribe, who would choose the less tattered or more legible portions of each. This possibility is supported by the occurrence of the "Musician" Psalms chiefly in groups, the numbers that occur consecutively in the various groups being 12, 7, 5, 4 (three times), 3 (twice), 2 (five times), and only 3 singly. Further, they are very largely in the early part of the Psalter, no less than forty-six, or 84 per cent, being in the first half; as though one roll were badly worn at the outer end, or the other roll at the inner. On the other hand, the individual Psalms may have been detached for ease of conducting, and each marked as the conductor's copy, which would account more satisfactorily for the repetition of the heading. Or again, there may have been only one relatively new set, and its musical owner may have died shortly after he had begun his work.

It is already evident, then, that the theory fits a number of the conditions, and it will be of interest to check how many of the phrases will at once take their place in the proposed framework. The Chief Musician can be safely identified with the Temple choirmaster, in agreement with Briggs and Moffatt, but without the very improbable supposition that he was the author or compiler of a collection.

"Lamnazeach" would hence mean "Choirmaster's Copy."[1] Authors' names and such words as "psalm," "song" or "prayer" may be disregarded for the present, since they occur indiscriminately. Tune names and musical instructions would, however, be far more appropriate on these copies than anywhere else, and would naturally be entered by his own hand as personal memoranda.

Notes as to the occasions of the Psalms could well have been written by him to form the bases of short preliminary talks to the choir in order to stimulate their interest and increase the feeling they put into

[1] It is significant that a typical rendering of the preposition "al" is "for the use of."

their singing; and it is of interest to compare with these the introductory notes to each hymn in the "Public School Hymn Book." Incidentally, the present explanation would solve a problem which has perplexed critics for many years—namely, the reason for the extremely doubtful authenticity of nearly all the statements. It has, in fact, been stated that every psalm provided with one of these prefaces contains internal evidence disproving any connexion with the episode in question. This would have been very surprising if their author were a responsible literary man, but not very unlikely if they were added in the form of private notes by a zealous musician.

Mystery Words.—There remain the mystery words, regarding which three different questions require solution—viz., (1) Why their form is unfamiliar, (2) Why the tradition as to their meaning has been lost in a land where memories were proverbially long, and (3) What are the actual meanings of each. The first question is answered at once and very effectively by the terms of our theory; for a choirmaster's notes would be written in roughly, in a musical "jargon" which would probably be unfamiliar to laymen, with numerous contractions, and possibly in a foreign language. A modern example may illustrate the results of these tendencies. It is possible that many centuries hence a translator of "Hymns Ancient and Modern" may be brought to a halt by the word "credim," prefixed to a line in each verse of "A few more years shall roll." He would probably find it beyond his powers to recognize in this the three Italian words "crescendo e dimuendo," meaning "louder and then softer." In the same way "Michtam" (for instance) may have one of the meanings suggested by the various conjectural derivations, or it may conceivably be parts of three Hebrew (or Arabic?) words run together.

Break in Tradition.—The reason for the break in the tradition has been given up as insoluble by nearly all the commentators, but can now be answered quite simply. In times of persecution the musical part of the services would tend to be abandoned, not only because of the far greater difficulty in providing it, but also because it would be regarded as non-essential and would conform less than usual with the mood of the worshippers. During the exile, for example, we are told in a well-known and very graphic passage that the captives hung up their harps. This occasion is, however, too early for our present purpose, and the interference with religion was in any case insufficient. But during the terrible epoch of Antiochus IV, when suppression was so much more intense, and when many were actually won from their allegiance, it was quite possible for the musical rendering of the services to cease completely, and for the musicians to disappear for a sufficiently long time to bring about a definite gap in the handing on of technical terms. It must be remembered that when transmission of knowledge, especially with regard to the arts, was by word of mouth, such a loss was far more likely than today, when the printing press has enabled a host of manuals to be published on every conceivable subject. It is quite likely, also, that the tyrant had made the Temple guilds a special object of extermination. Finally, the Maccabees as a family may have lacked an ear for music and not encouraged its revival.

Methods of Research.—Two methods are available for arriving at the meaning of a word: first an attempt at translation, followed by an inspection of the result to see if it fulfils a need; and secondly the inverse process of ascertaining the needs first, and then judging whether they are met by any of the available words. It is the second process that is chiefly being applied in this article to reinforce the direct method, on the principle of tackling an intricacy from both ends. The great difficulty of the first method is due to the peculiarities of the Hebrew language, in that, first, a single word may have a number of meanings, some of them unrelated to one another, and, secondly, nearly all the vowels were omitted in writing, so that several different words might be represented by the same characters. Quite apart, therefore, from the special difficulties described earlier, direct translation is apt to be accompanied by much uncertainty.

It may be of advantage to set down at this stage the headings and directions that have fairly established meanings.

Titles with Known Meanings

Psalm.—Greek general title, derived from the LXX (Greek version of the Psalter). Literal meaning—Songs accompanied on stringed instruments.

Mizmor.—Hebrew equivalent of "Psalm," much used in individual headings (as in Ps. 4, "A Psalm of David").

Tehillim (sing. tehillah).—Hebrew general title for Psalter. Literal meaning—"Song(s) of Praise." "Tehillah" is, however, only applied to Ps. 145 in the individual headings.

Tephillah (pl. -im).—"Prayer" (as in Ps. 17, "A Prayer of David").

Shir or *Shirah.*—"Song" in its most general sense (as in Ps. 30).

Song of Ascents (*Degrees*).—Psalms sung by pilgrims going up to Jerusalem for a festival.

Names of Tunes

Aijeleth-hash-Shahar—The hind of the dawn (Ps. 22).
Al-Tasheth—Destroy not (Pss. 57, 58, 59, 72).
Gittith—Of Gath, of a winepress (Pss. 8, 81, 84).
Jonath-eylim-rechokim—Dove of the far-off terebinths.
Shoshannim—Lilies or Anemones (Pss. 45, 69).
Shushan-eduth—Lily of the testimony (Ps. 60).

Musical Directions

Bineginoth—with stringed instruments—*i.e.*, either the lyre or the harp, or possibly the viol.

Nechiloth—with wind instruments—*i.e.*, pipes.

Alamoth is usually supposed to mean "soprano instruments"; but as it is applied to Ps. 46 only, which would seem to call for robust treatment, this can be regarded as doubtful.

Now there is a description of the orchestral accompaniment in 2 Chron. xx, 28 for such a song as Ps. 46, the occasion being in the opinion of many the actual one to which this psalm refers, and the sons of Korah (the "Collectors" of the psalm) being jointly responsible

for the music. The instrumental combination is given as "lutes, lyres and trumpets," and may be that defined by "Alamoth."

Sheminith literally means "eighth," and has hence been supposed to signify "lower octave" or "bass," although the Hebrew scale knew nothing of octaves or eight-note scales. It is used only for two mournful Psalms (6 and 12), for which the tone of a tenor or bass viol would no doubt be suitable.

Higgaion.—A solemn sound (in text of Ps. xcii, 3; and with "Selah" after Ps. ix, 16).

Uncertain Terms

The terms that are still of uncertain meaning chiefly consist of a few obvious names of tunes, such as Muth-labban, the words Maschil, Michtam and Shiggaion, which are assumed by most commentators to refer to the literary nature of the psalms to which they are prefixed; and Selah. Many explanations have been suggested for them and the contents scrutinized with great care wherever they occur, but the great lack of consistency always experienced has hitherto stood in the way of any satisfactory solution. Since our present hypothesis treats them as notes by a musician, it will be helpful to consider what memoranda would be required in the circumstances apart from those already discussed, first as headings applying to the whole psalm, and secondly in the body of the psalm.

On the analogy of present-day hymns, a heading or headnote might serve the following purposes:

1. To state the occasions for which the psalm would be suitable.
2. To give a general instruction as to expression.
3. To record memoranda as to rehearsal or performance.

As regards the first category, there has been no consistent attempt at arrangement, comparable with, for example, the divisions used in a modern hymn book into those suitable for Morning, Evening, Christmas, Baptism, and so on. Even identical psalms, such as 14 and 53, are spaced far apart. The division into five books seems to have been almost arbitrary; and the arrangement of similar psalms in groups, such as "Songs of Ascents," was almost certainly derived from their originally forming separate collections. The only apparent example of this class of heading is "Song for the dedication of a House" (Ps. 30); but internal evidence points almost conclusively to this marking a single notable occasion—namely, the dedication of the Second Temple, built after the return from exile. Finally, if titles of this kind were used a number of obvious ones would have been expected, such as "Harvest Thanksgiving" for Ps. 65.

General expression marks are used occasionally today, such as "Joyfully," "Solemnly," "Soft and Slow." It cannot be said, however, that any of the psalms with the same headings possess any marked characteristics in common. Conversely, those psalms to which an obvious expression mark is applicable, such as 46, 51 and 66, are not so provided.

The third class, therefore, seems the most hopeful. Possible notes

are "To be learned by heart," "Explain the meaning (or structure)," "Requires careful practice," "To be sung antiphonally (or full)," "Do not drag," "Processional," or "Full orchestra." Musical directions have already been quoted in which single types of instruments have been specified, and it would be expected that there would also be a word or words for a more elaborate accompaniment, such as the last term suggested ("Full orchestra") or a given combination of instruments such as that already quoted from 2 Chronicles.

The chief doubtful words themselves may now be considered.

Maschil is used at the head of thirteen psalms; and as the most probable derivation is "to be wise," or "to instruct," it is usually explained as a description meaning "didactive psalm." To this it can be objected that the psalms in question are not markedly instructional; and also that the didactive psalm *par excellence*, "Hear ye this, all ye people" (Ps. 49), is simply described as a "Psalm." Everything points to its being a musical note; and as the word occurs in the text of one psalm (xlvii, 7) with the meaning of "skilful music," its meaning is probably "mixed instruments" or even "full orchestra."

Michtam is used with six psalms—viz., Ps. 16 and the group from Ps. 56 to Ps. 60. It is usually translated "Golden," but has also been rendered "Engraved writing" (LXX), "Hidden," and "Atonement for sin"; but none of these is appropriate for all cases. For example, "Golden Psalm" has no special application to them; while if it implied outstanding qualities, one would certainly have expected it to be used, for instance, with the magnificent Ps. 68 ("Let God arise"), or 67 ("God be merciful unto us and bless us"), or 46 ("God is our hope and strength"). Again it must be a musical note. "Engrave on the memory"—*i.e.*, "learn by heart"—would suit one of the derivations, but this is probably already covered by the note translated "to teach." Probably, therefore, it refers, like the preceding term, to the accompaniment.

Finally, the word "Selah" remains to be considered; and as it is always found in the body of the psalm, it has been the most discussed of all the notes, and is still the most interesting. It occurs in only thirty-nine psalms, and these almost without exception are headed "For the Chief Musician." Many suggestions have been made as to its meaning, one of the oldest being "for ever," while the Greek version (LXX) translates it "Diapsalma"—*i.e.*, "interposed symphony." One of the chief difficulties in evaluating the various explanations lay in the largely fortuitous placing of the word; for although it often occurs at the end of a train of thought, this was by no means always the case. In many cases no reason could be deduced from the context for its insertion.

But the assumption that it was a choirmaster's note at once enables consistency to be achieved. There would naturally be considerable variation in the method of inserting a marginal note with regard to a change between two verses, according to the idiosyncrasy of the writer. This is well illustrated by the case of the word "change" today, which for some reason has nearly always to be added to a modern psalter in writing. One man will append it to the verse before

the change, another will place it beside the verse after; while careless or shaky writing might cause it to "slip" to the second verse after.

An examination shows every sign that similar displacements have happened, for there is always a suitable "break" in the meaning within one or two verses of the word. For example, in Ps. 68 ("Let God arise") the three "changes" should come after verses 6, 18 and 31, instead of verses 7, 19 and 32, or one verse earlier than marked; while in Ps. 20 it should come after verse 5 instead of verse 3, and in Ps. 9 after verse 18 instead of verse 16, or two verses later in each case. Thus "Selah" may be regarded as definitely indicating a musical device for the purpose of marking the end of a strophe or stanza. Incidentally, the last "slip" is of great importance owing to the occurrence of "Higgaion" with "Selah." In its correct position a "solemn interlude" is entirely appropriate; but the present placing has given rise to other conjectures as to its meaning.

As regards the exact nature of the instruction, there are four methods employed in music today for marking a change. These are (*a*) a pause, (*b*) a rallentando, (*c*) a change of tune, and (*d*) an interlude. Of these, (*c*) is ruled out as a general meaning, first by the headings apparently specifying a single tune for the whole psalm, and secondly by the frequency with which the changes often occur. An interlude (*d*) is much more likely, and, moreover, is that specified in the Greek version; but it is not altogether appropriate when, as in Ps. 46, it occurs at the end of a psalm. The same holds good with regard to the pause (*a*); but slackening of the pace (*b*) would suit all cases. In hymn-singing the stanzas are separated nowadays by a plain pause, though on special occasions an interlude is played; but a century ago interludes were very much more common, and were even commonly used between lines, as in the chorale "O Thou the true and only Light" in Mendelssohn's *St Paul*. It is most probable, therefore, that the word was meant to indicate a new stanza by any of the musical devices (*a*), (*b*) and (*d*) that suited the occasion and the taste of contemporary music.

Conclusion.—The supposition that the annotations were personal notes "pencilled" in his copy by the Temple choirmaster will be seen to fit all contingencies and to provide more definite explanations of the meanings of the terms. It appears certain that further research along these lines will assist in answering the remaining questions associated with the use of the Psalms in Biblical times.

W. Wilson.

Bibliography

The author would like to make special acknowledgments to the following works: Prof. W. E. Oesterley, *A Fresh Approach to the Psalter* (1938); Prof. Davison, *The Century Bible*, "Psalms," vol. i; Bishop Barry, *The Teacher's Prayer Book*, pp. 175-258.

The Land and Sacramental Theology

At the present time there are indications that the Church is taking more interest in the land. There is a purely ethical side to this; the world is short of food, and thus "of works"; the Church should do something to aid the material welfare of humanity. There is also another side to it which brings these works into direct relationship with the Church's faith. Ideally, works and faith should be one, and the purpose of this article is to ask whether, taking the land as its starting-point, its foundation, the Church cannot bring to mankind not only material benefits, but with them a deeper and more real faith in the Living God. Within the space of a short article an attempt has to be made to reconstruct the outline of our theology without doing violence to the essential doctrines of the Church, so as to include not only the relationship of God with man, but of God with nature, and so with the land; and the relationship of man with the land as well.

Any form of religion in which nature or the land is said to be an essential part is by many dismissed as being primitive or pagan, uncultured and irrational—in short, lacking in all philosophical reasonableness. Anything which is of the earth, earthy, can have nothing, it is said, to do with our redemption and heaven, least of all the particular Kingdom of Heaven revealed to us by Jesus Christ. However, heretical as it may seem, this is an earthy outline of His Kingdom and nothing else. We have not the space to preface our remarks by a few pointers given in recent times by such people as Archbishop Temple, Canon Raven, T. S. Eliot, and other writers of note, but they are among those who, in trying to find the way back to God, do sometimes look to the land.

One possible reason why Christian thinkers down the ages have disregarded and dismissed nature and the land from their consideration is not far to seek. The history of serious thought is soaked in dualism of one kind and another, a legacy from Greek pagan philosophy which has not been all spent. Theological arguments have been concerned with the relationship of grace to nature, the impact upon nature of revelation, and the coming together of the natural and the supernatural. Opinions have differed; no satisfactory explanation of the twoness of these dualisms has been produced. Moreover, the meaning of the word "nature" has not only changed down the ages,[1] but it has never been satisfactorily explained, except as the All of experience. Cowper seems to have grasped the truth:

> Nature is but a name for any fact
> Whose cause is God.[2]

Nature is possibly the most ambiguous word used by theologians, unless it means this All. It is perfectly true that there appears to many people a tension between what we conceive as nature and what we conceive as grace (or revelation); or between this life and the fuller

[1] A good survey of the changing philosophical import of "Nature" is to be found in R. G. Collingwood's *Idea of Nature* (1945).

[2] *The Winter Walk at Noon.* See also H.D.B., vol. 3, p. 493b, para. 3.

life of heaven. This apparent tension is due, not to a form of dualism in reality, but to a narrow, distorted manner of thinking. We know, for example, that nature and grace meet, they come together, but we still desire to see them apart. We may say they are the two halves of reality, forgetting here that the mathematical maxim does not hold and that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. If anything is truly super-natural, it is God Himself as Creator, standing apart from His creation; but He does not choose to reveal Himself to man except through that which is truly and fully nature.

Another dualism which has done much to support the particular dualism of religious thought—namely, that of matter and spirit—has of recent years been exploded. The hard-boiled dogmatic materialism much in favour from earliest times till the end of the nineteenth century is no longer tenable in a completely dualistic sense, and is therefore inadmissible for theological debate. St Paul, contrary to some people's opinion, is not a thorough-going dualist at all; while it is true that some of his passages give this impression, others do not. A sudden conversion, such as his, may be the cause of his apparent dualism. It is St Augustine,[1] followed by St Thomas Aquinas, Calvin, Karl Barth, and others, who has defended, and defended nobly, a dualist theology; but are we sure that their theology is a clearer exposition of the divine will of God than much that can be put against it?

In place of any hard and fast dualism, sacramentalism is an alternative approach to reality and experience as these actually are in being. Of this, human marriage happens to be an example which is obvious to everyone. Two people, two souls, become one flesh. That seems a contradiction in words, for they always remain two souls. A contradiction in logic as it may seem, experience happens to provide many examples of successful marriages where, without loss of personality by either, the man and wife are indeed one. This is nothing more than an example of true sacramentalism, and this, rather than dualism, must be the approach to theology which embraces man's relationships to the land, as well as to God. We are concerned here with two things which, it certainly may appear, are quite separate: (*a*) man's contact with nature, and in particular his contact with the land as the means of deriving the primary requirement of his existence, food; and (*b*) man's religious feelings, and those in particular which find expression in worship. To the majority of people, Christians and others alike, these are two quite independent concerns of human existence (the parson on Sunday, the grocer on Monday, etc.). This separation of life is, to say the least of it, tragic in practical consequences and ruinous to a full meaning of life which the gospels seek to proclaim. To use the actual words of St John, I believe *Zoe* is the completion of, not the contradiction of, *Psyche*. He that hateth his life and is prepared to lose it (John xii, 25) is not the man who turns his back on all that this life means, but he who knows that it is incomplete and by

[1] Theological dualism really begins with Augustine, and is different in a good many ways from that of the Greek philosophers.

itself unreasonable.[1] *Psyche* for the sake of *Psyche* is pointless, *Psyche* for the sake of *Zoe* is at once holy and sin-bound. All religions except Christianity are spiritual, concerned only with mind and spirit, and possibly some form of mental psychical redemption from the real world because this is devilish and evil. Religion then becomes escapism. Christianity is not spiritual, but sacramental of love, love being the nature of God, and love demands freedom in order to be love at all. This freedom is such as to permit evil and sin; thus the gospel has to proclaim redemption as a way to love, as well as love as a means of redemption. This, it must be frankly admitted, is brushing aside the harassing "problem of evil" all too quickly, but it has to be mentioned. Also, it is forgotten very largely that God accepts the responsibility of evil (Isa. xlv, 7) so as to make His creation free, with every possibility of evil always being the possibility of good.

It is really a mistaken view which says that Christianity began with Christ, or that the Church came into being at the first Pentecost after our Lord's ascension. Christ and the events following His death and resurrection were the fulfilment and completing act of what began far back with Abraham, with the first covenant God made with His people. Since the marriage symbolism is used in the O.T. of God's relationship with man, we can say that the engagement announced at Sinai was only fulfilled as a true marriage in the Incarnation, and in particular in the upper room where the apparently so simple event took place which has become the most important and significant of all historic events.

The religion of the O.T. is not a philosophical concept of mind and spirit. It is an active, real, living, organic religion of relationships bound up with man's need of food. The religious sense of the O.T. is mysterious because anything which is real does not cease, but rather becomes mysterious. This mystery is at once tremendous as well as fascinating. The Great Reality, as a personal God, is at once over against us as judge and ruler and with us as father and guide. The O.T. is not governed by timeless psychological and intellectual concepts, but by events in and through which God shows Himself. He is in all the vicissitudes of life, not in possible ethical or æsthetical theories.[2] It is here that we must face the conflict and the cleavage between Hebraic religious thought on the one hand and Greek philosophy on the other, a conflict which theologians have dodged. The former is quick and active in reality, the latter speculative and theoretical. What has happened is that the Church, instead of using Greek modes of thought and expression as a tool with which to handle Hebraic ideas, has largely re-thought the revelation of Hebraic religion in Greek thought, so that Jeremiah and Abraham, not to mention Christ Himself, have had their meanings distorted to agree with the all-holy, infallible Plato and Aristotle. Every concession has been made to the convenience of thought, none at all to the actual literal history of reality. To think

[1] Or, to put it another way, Life Eternal, *Zoe*, is always the life that *is*, rather than the life that *shall be*. *Cp.* John xii, 50 and xvii, 3.

[2] See, *e.g.*, Söderblom's *The Living God*, p. 309.

both wisely and correctly about God in the abstract has become more respectable, because it is said to be more intelligent(?), than to live with, under, and for God in reality. Every church and every churchgoer today is a witness to the lasting power of Christ over the mere ideas of Plato and others. The ideas of the O.T. are dismissed all too lightly with comments about the primitive minds of its characters. A good example of this is in the 78th Psalm: "A dull historic psalm"; or, "It [the 78th Psalm] belongs to a theology which has long passed away, and was never applicable to any but the people of Israel."[1] Such a statement as this confesses that the religious feeling of Israel has been outmoded, that God's promises and care for a particular people and at a particular time in history are no longer true. God is thus said to be, not changeless and timeless and universal, but one who used to think with man that religion, the land, and food were all related, but now, like such commentators, has learnt to be a little more intelligent! For the merely spiritual-minded Christian it is a dull historical psalm perhaps, for the sacramental realist it is fascinating. To pay lip service (as in the Psalms) to a God who once upon a time saved the world in a food crisis, and at the same time to suggest that the same God has nothing to do with a similar, but much larger, crisis in the world today, is to support a changing God: not the God of the O.T., not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

What, it will be asked, are the grounds for this criticism of philosophical theology and strong comments on biblical commentators? Upon what grounds can we base a sacramental theology of reality? What is the word of our "proof-text"? The Word made flesh, Jesus Christ Himself, the measure, the yardstick, of all things (Eph. iv, 13). Our reference is to a person and not a word, a reality of history rather than an idea of the mind. This is important. Our Lord was not the Son of God because of what He said; what He said is of great importance only because, as revelation of God, His Son, He proclaimed Himself Son of *Man*. The only great revelation given to man by God which sums up but does not make all other revelations null and void, the Incarnation itself, is with the natural order. It is grace and truth, but grace and truth in, by, and through nature. In His own person Jesus Christ was organic, the beginning of creation (Rev. iii, 14; Col. i, 15), and yet creation's summit and crowning-point.[2] It is because both nature and grace, as well as nature and revelation, meet in Jesus Christ, and because He showed forth life as one whole, not as consisting of "two natures," that a dualistic theology said to be founded upon Him is untrue to its own foundations. Without being double-minded—and even to suggest that He might have been is rank blasphemy—He walked with His feet four-square on the earth and with His mind in heaven. He was the rustic with the inexpressible understanding of nature which rustics

[1] Oesterley, *The Psalms*, p. 363.

[2] For a very full and highly involved discussion of the organic conception of the Incarnation, see L. S. Thorton's *Incarnate Lord*. It is a long and difficult book, all the conclusions of which cannot be accepted as they stand; it is, however, the only treatment of the doctrine of the Incarnation from the modern and biological standpoint that is consistent with the historic doctrines of the Church.

have, He was the true Son of God, who relied, not on an idea about God, but on a relationship with the Father.

The revelation given by and through Jesus Christ was historical in time, but He left a perfected, God-given perpetuation of this in the Last Supper. The Eucharist is an expression, not only of the redemption which He brought, but of His whole self and revelation. Just as His teaching, His gospel, and His ethics were not "new," so in the Last Supper He took up and completed the form of sacrificial offering, as a means of worship and communion, from the Old Testament.[1] It is only a narrow, limited, and distorted view of the sacramental form of the Eucharist which will really admit dualistic tension between "grace" and "nature." These two meet; they come together as being co-mingled, without losing their apparent separate identities. Bread and wine, the fruits of the land, which presuppose in fact the reality of the land, are offered to God, not because they are themselves evil, but because they are His ("these Thy creatures," as the Prayer Book puts it). It is this offering which provides man with the essence of his faith, his means of communion at its highest level, and the way given by Christ Himself of redemption. While the Eucharist is an expression of the whole life of Christ in its fullest sense, it should also be an expression of our *whole* lives as we partake in it. That it is not very often so is not the fault of the Eucharist, but of our poor, half-hearted, dry participation in it. It is customary to divide our theology and keep Revelation, Redemption, and Communion in three distinct parts of our faith; this is a serious mistake, for each of these is only seen fully when they meet, first in the Incarnation and then in the everlasting expression of this, the Eucharist. For this the offerings from God's earth are a necessary starting-point. What God has so clearly joined together, then, is it right that theology in theory, and the Church in practice, should attempt to put asunder?

If such is a reasonable, an intelligent theory of sacramental Christian faith, what, it will be asked, are its practical consequences and results? "By its fruits . . ." What fruits do we seek from such a faith? The social and economic difficulties of the world to-day are different, and yet not so very different after all from what they have been throughout history. We have first a world shortage of food, and it is reasonable to suppose that if all people everywhere were assured of a full and adequate supply of food, if of nothing else, then all the other international, political, and social problems would be at least different, and very possibly less pressing and hazardous. Man is only just beginning to realize that he has abused the land and that it is now turning upon him. Even now a vast proportion of people are unable to realize that prior to food production must come the welfare of the land itself. Running parallel with this shortage of food, and this always threatens famine,

[1] Space does not allow us to develop this point here. It is informative, however, to consider the Christian Eucharist in the light of, *e.g.*, Deut. xxvi. There is a three-action pattern of worship: (*a*) offering, (*b*) communion, and (*c*) re-establishment of the covenant with God. This three-action shape, although developed during the history of the Church into four, seven, and other forms of pattern, is still, I believe, the basis of the true eucharistic pattern.

is the shortage and poverty of man's true convictions about God, and in particular his belief in Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lover of all mankind. Agricultural experts are working at their problem, the churches are working at theirs. The real challenge comes in suggesting that the work of one is complementary to the other, and that if they could be brought to work together they would bear one another's burdens, both for the benefit of man and the glory of God. If they continue to work separately, in their own little compartments, the agriculturalist will always be faced with the inadequacy of science to solve all his problems; the churches will be left with but a spiritual ethic as their only stock-in-trade, and this will magnify, but will not overcome, the sin of the world. It did not need the revelation of Christ to tell man he was a sinner, but the world needed Christ to overcome the sin of the world. The task, then, of His Church is not to proclaim man as a sinner, but to act on behalf of Christ as His redemptive power. The Church can only act thus by regarding life as a sacramental whole in which the land, as the source of human food, food which is the starting-point of all life, is allowed to play an important part. The land, so far as the Church is concerned, should not only be the ground of its works, but the foundation of its faith.

Though it is almost impossible to describe, there is among some true countrymen a particular living active element in their religious faith; they are not articulate; it is not something which finds expression in words: it is an attitude towards their life and their work which is silently Godward. Otto[1] does not profess to be able to explain the religious feelings of the countryman, save to say that it makes more profound reaction on him than his urban brother. Let us say that, because his work brings him into more immediate and daily contact with nature, and because he depends upon God in the production of his crops, the countryman becomes schooled in an insight which sees across the abyss between the Creator and His creation, which others can only read of and meditate upon. His feeling for God is a seeking after grace which is "within," and not external to, nature. As with the prophet, not to seek after and follow this religious feeling is unnatural (Isa. i, 3); to seek and find its fulfilment in true worship is for him anything but supernatural. Unfortunately, it is not always that the Church, its preachers and teachers in particular, is capable of doing anything about this peculiar faith of the countryman, except to smother it with something which to him is a little less real than his own sacramental experience, inarticulate as it is, has taught him. And for this reason, I believe, the faith of the whole Church is the poorer.

What I have tried to outline here presents a challenge today to the churches and to all who are concerned with the spreading of the Kingdom of God. How we are to meet this challenge, and what practical steps the Church should take, it is not for me here to suggest in detail. That the practice of agriculture is in some special way the concern of the Church is slowly being realized, if not in Europe, in some parts of the mission-field. Here and there it is being realized that

[1] *The Idea of the Holy*, p. 127.

because the earth *is* the Lord's the Church has a duty towards its welfare. Ways and means must be found, too, of encouraging and fostering, rather than stifling, the religious sparks to which man's contact with nature so obviously gives rise. The reality of this mystery, or the mysteriousness of this reality, whichever way one likes to express it, should find a more prominent expression, if possible, in the Church's liturgy and worship.

As nothing more than a tailpiece to what has been said above, one suggestion, perhaps a wild and far-fetched one, can be thrown out. It is this—the new, or at least unorthodox, approach to the Christian theology of earthy sacramentalism might provide a new basis for discussions aimed towards the reunion of Christendom. While the various doctrines of orders, ministries, and sacraments are important, it is worth going back, working down further, to the earth itself as the true foundation of the true and undivided whole Church, which then could more truly use as its highest expression of worship:

> Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts, heaven and earth are full of Thy Glory. Glory be to Thee, O Lord most High.

W. S. Boycott.

CORRESPONDENCE

IS THE TERM "CAPTIVITY EPISTLES" JUSTIFIED?

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

I read Dr Wedell's closely reasoned paper under the above title in your October number with considerable interest and appreciation. Dr Wedell has argued that all the so-called "captivity" references in these epistles are to be taken as metaphorical and not literal. However, in any assessment of the weight that we should attach to his argument there are, I submit, three seemingly extraneous, though not therefore less important, considerations which we should also bear in mind. They are these:

(i) *St Paul was in fact in "captivity" for a considerable period of time.* This is in no way an inference from the "captivity" epistles: it is stated explicitly in the narrative of Acts, quite apart from the perplexing incidental reference at 2 Cor. xi, 23. At the very least St Paul was a "captive" for no less than five years—three years at Cæsarea (Acts xxiii, 23-xxvi, 32: A.D. 56-59?) and two years in Rome (Acts xxviii, 30: A.D. 59-61?). Is it likely that none of his extant epistles date from this period? If they do not, we must suppose either that one who had previously been an inveterate letter-writer for many years suddenly ceased on his arrest in Jerusalem to write letters for no apparent reason, or that by an extraordinary concatenation of circumstances only those letters written between 49 and 56 (ten letters in all) have been preserved, while those written between 56 and 61 have been lost. But neither possibility is probable. We have, therefore, to reckon with the *a priori* likelihood that contained in the Pauline

corpus are not only one, but several, "captivity" epistles, irrespective of whether we today are able to identify them as such or not.

(ii) *The distribution of the "captivity" references in the Pauline corpus as a whole is very unequal.* Apart from the solitary exception at Rom. xvi, 7 (see below), all the "captivity" references occur in Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon. Furthermore, the references in these epistles are not single references in each: in Ephesians there are three (iii, 1; iv, 1; vi, 20), in Philippians four (i, 7, 13, 14, 17), in Colossians three (iv, 3 10, 18), and in Philemon five (1, 9, 10, 13, 23). When we consider the Pauline corpus as a whole such an unequal distribution of "captivity" references requires explanation. If we suppose that the references are to be taken literally and that St Paul was indeed in prison when writing these epistles and at liberty when writing *e.g.* 1 and 2 Corinthians, the distribution is easily accounted for; but it is not so easily accounted for if we maintain that the references are metaphorical—*i.e.* it is exceedingly odd that a metaphor should have been so popular with St Paul as to have been used *fifteen* times in *four* epistles (consisting of *fifteen* chapters), but only *once* in the remaining *six* epistles (consisting of *fifty-nine* chapters).

(iii) *The "captivity" references in Acts are literal and not metaphorical.* Dr Wedell has argued that St Paul's reference at Rom. xvi, 7 to Andronicus and Junias as "my fellow-prisoners" must necessarily be metaphorical because Andronicus and Junias were not with St Paul, nor was he is prison himself, when he wrote the Epistle to the Romans; and that this metaphorical use in Romans should serve as a pointer to the metaphorical interpretation of similar references in the "captivity" epistles (Col. iv, 10; Philem. 23). Yet may it not equally well be argued that the reference in Romans is literal, and that Andronicus and Junias, now in Rome (or Ephesus?), had shared in one of the Apostle's earlier "captivities" referred to at 2 Cor. xi, 23? Dr Wedell regards this argument as "far-fetched." But in any case, if we are to go outside the "captivity" epistles there can be no doubt that the relevant references in Acts are literal. Four times in the later chapters of Acts we find references to the "bonds" of St Paul's five-year "captivity" in Jerusalem, Cæsarea, and Rome (Acts xx, 23; xxiii, 29; xxvi, 29, 31). It may be, of course, that Acts is not history and that the speeches are fabrications: but it may also be (and most scholars think it far more likely) that the later chapters at any rate rest on a sound eye-witness basis, and that in the speeches in these chapters are preserved, if not *ipsissima verba*, at least the substance of what was said, and here and there an actual phrase. And if this be so, may we not legitimately interpret "my bonds became manifest in Christ throughout the whole prætorian guard" (Phil. i, 13) in the light of "the Holy Ghost testifieth unto me in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me" (Acts xx, 23), or "my child, whom I have begotten in my bonds, Onesimus" (Philem. 10) in the light of the words of the prisoner in the dock, "I would to God that . . . all that hear me this day might become such as I am, except these bonds" (Acts xxvi, 29)?

Inevitably, no one of these considerations is by itself decisive. But cumulatively I think they should make us pause seriously before we

declare ourselves convinced by Dr Wedell's argument as it stands. It may very well be that St Paul came ultimately to speak of his "bonds" metaphorically and to call himself "the prisoner of Christ Jesus" in a mystical or semi-mystical sense; but for myself I can only conceive that he did so when writing from a situation where "bonds" and "imprisonment" were real. And I believe, in consequence, in spite of what I have learned from Dr Wedell, that the term "Captivity Epistles" is still abundantly justified.

Yours, etc.,

Birmingham University. H. F. D. Sparks.

INITIATION NOT DISINTEGRATED

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

It cannot be denied that the relation between baptism and confirmation is "one of essential unity rather than of mere liturgical association." Yet the two moments of the one sacrament are distinct in all catholic rites of initiation, and it would be strange if, in so vital a matter, the ancient practice of the Western Church should perpetuate a theological blunder of the first magnitude. It is strange indeed that anyone should be content with the statement that, with regard to water baptism, the first moment, "it is almost impossible to define what it confers apart from confirmation."[1]

Christian initiation finds its ground in two clearly defined moments: the baptism of Christ by St John and the descent upon Him of the Dove. That baptism brings us inexorably to the principle of substitution and exchange: the sinless Redeemer Himself undergoes the rite of purification whereby sinful men prepared to face redemption. Substitution, indeed, is a rock of offence. Sophisticated theologians endeavour to remove it from their doctrines of Atonement. But they fail. Theories that are intended to appease our individualistic moral sense cannot show forth the glory of God. The water baptism of Jesus was the outward sign of the vicarious penitence whereby He exchanged the form of God for the form of a bondservant. The chrismation of Jesus was the outward sign of the inauguration of that royal nation and holy priesthood wherein the children of wrath could exchange their wages with the divine Sonship of their King and High Priest. Remove these outrageous exchanges, and you preach "another gospel."

Infant baptism is a fact of catholic practice that needs explanation rather than excuse. It is a bad excuse that invents an irresistible sacramental grace infused into an individual baby.

It is wiser to see in baptism and confirmation the foundation of two laws: "Bear ye one another's burdens" and "Each man shall bear his own load." The practice of infant baptism witnesses to the fact that in being saved in Christ we must also be saved in one another. The New Covenant demands the faith of the whole Church, a multitude of interdependent souls. No man can be saved as an individual; the paralytic must be carried to the Saviour by his friends. It is only

[1] J. G. Davies, Theology, November, 1947.

after that has happened that he can rise and bear his own load, and carry, in his turn, the burdens of other men.

So the first moment of initiation enables us to draw vicariously upon the sacrificial actions and passions of those who are already Christians. The second moment enables us to act vicariously ourselves, to become sacrificial persons, ourselves within the holy priesthood. No child is too young to have his burdens borne by others. But is not the Western Church wise in deferring the sacramental moment whereby a child carries his own load—by covenanted grace—until he can make a personal act of conscious repentance and faith? Where God applies the New Covenant there must be a human response; and our response as members of one another precedes our response as individuals. We are the anointed sons of God only because we have been made members of a mystical Body.

So the Holy Spirit in the Church is given indeed to baptized infants. But the power of the Holy Spirit and the risen Christ as it may be shown forth in their conscious individual choices, to do or to suffer, is not *covenanted* until the second moment of their initiation is consummated. Doubtless the Spirit will energize them, but not, in this way, by *covenant*. And it is impossible to suppose that grace to make conscious choices can be covenanted until conscious choices can be made by nature. In the Orthodox Church, therefore, the grace of confirmation is conferred in a manner that obscures the second moment of the whole covenant of initiation.

It is clear that the institution of godparents rests, not upon pastoral expedience, but upon the necessity of declaring and actualizing the vicariousness of the first moment. It is equally clear that unless godparents are confirmed, communicant Christians their act of sponsoring makes theological nonsense.

Yours,
F. Coventry.
(*Asst Curate, All Saints, West Dulwich.*)

BOOK REVIEWS

The Authority of the Old Testament. By A. G. Hebert. Faber and Faber. 15s.

In this book Fr Hebert tackles one of the most important of present-day Old Testament issues. Avoiding on the one hand the dogmatic acceptance of its divine authority which leads to the literal and uncritical acceptance of everything it contains and on the other the critical dissipation of the Old Testament into a merely human growth, the author finds it to be a book in which God's word is given through fallible and imperfect men. He accepts freely and fully the results of critical scholarship, but is not content to rest there. Instead, he seeks to build on those results a more solid structure than the uncritically-based edifice which has for so many collapsed. He brings to it the historical sense that seeks to recover the contemporary eye for every

situation while recognizing that it is but a moment in a great development, and at the same time demands that its revelation be always tested in the light of the New Testament. For he recognizes degrees of revelation, and finds the supreme revelation to be in Christ, with its crown and climax in the Resurrection.

With all this the reviewer is in full agreement, and he commends the fine treatment of all these questions which stands here. He is less sure that the author is so skilful in the sections which follow. He reviews the story of the canonization of the Old Testament Scriptures and the purpose which that canonization was designed to serve. Here there is little that is fundamentally new, and indeed our information about the process of canonization is less complete than we could wish, and at more than one point we have nothing more sure than conjecture. To the reviewer it would seem that the author has turned aside somewhat from the question of the authority of the Old Testament, and that he does not return to it with anything like the force the earlier part of the book had led one to expect.

To recognize that in the Old Testament God speaks through imperfect men is not enough, for God has spoken through many other imperfect men besides the writers of the Old Testament. To recognize that the Old Testament is the pledge and promise of Christ, in Whom its hope is realized, is also not enough, for it might conceivably be superseded by its fulfilment and its authority vanish in the presence of the New, by which Fr Hebert claims that it is in any case to be tested. The author goes on to offer guidance for the literal and spiritual, or mystical, interpretation of the Old Testament by the Christian reader, but to the reviewer at least he does not give a clear answer to the question why it should still have authority for the Christian. Yet he believes that the answer is implicit in this book, though less clearly formulated than could have been hoped, and a brief concluding summary might have made it more clear.

If the reviewer mistakes not, the answer would run somewhat as follows. The Old Testament is more than the preparation for the New, prefiguring in its revelation in history and in personality the supreme revelation in history and in personality in Christ. The two Testaments belong together, and there is a profound unity of the Bible. The Old is necessary to the completeness of the New, and we should rather speak of the authority of the Bible than of either Testament alone. Everywhere the Old Testament looks forward to something beyond itself, and if that something is not a delusion it is to be found in the New Testament and in Christ. The New Testament is thus not alone the *test* of the revelation of the Old; it is the *guarantee* of the authority of the Old. For it is in the light of the New Testament that we see more clearly that the hand of God is in the Old, and its revelation is differentiated from the partial revelation of God which is to be found in Nature and in other men and books. The Old Testament does not lead by natural evolution to the New, so that without the New one could deduce the life and work of Christ from the Old. Yet that life and work give a fullness of meaning to the Old it could not otherwise have, and provide firm ground for the belief that the Old Testament

not only *did* lead to Christ, but *was intended* by the God whose partial revelation it records to lead to Christ. The authority of the Old Testament is thus not alone the authority of a partial divine revelation which it contains, but the authority of the whole divine revelation culminating in Christ of which it is an integral and inseparable part.

If the reviewer does any injustice to the author he expresses his regret; if he does not, he would express his wholehearted agreement. He would add that some things in the Old Testament were already superseded within the period of the Old Testament. Others were superseded in the New Testament. At the same time the New Testament takes the Old Testament for granted, and lifts up into its own authority all that is not implicitly or explicitly superseded. That is why the authority of the Old Testament cannot satisfactorily be treated save in a study of the authority of the Bible.

It is often supposed that the authority of the Bible is something that rests on faith, and is therefore subjectively based. Faith is rather the subjective response to its authority, as the good citizen responds to the authority of the law by obeying its behests. The authority of the Bible rests on the evidence that God was active in event and in personality, and that both belonged together, and that the whole process of the Biblical revelation culminated in the death and resurrection of Christ, which were charged with demonstrably unique power.

Of the many excellent passages the book contains no mention can here be made. The reviewer has noted a large number, and no reader will fail to be both stimulated and impressed. On p. 135 the author expresses his agreement with Sellin's view of the date of Deuteronomy as given in the English edition of his *Introduction to the Old Testament*, without, apparently, being aware that Sellin abandoned this view in the later German editions of his work. In general, however, Fr Hebert is abreast of Old Testament scholarship. The publisher also is to be congratulated on the production of a book which it is a pleasure to handle.

H. H. Rowley.

Manchester.

The Arrow and the Sword: An Essay in Detection. By Hugh Ross Williamson. With a preface by V. A. Demant. Faber and Faber. 10s. 6d.

Mr Williamson believes that the deaths of William Rufus and St Thomas Becket were probably ritual murders in the ancient pagan tradition of the "Slain King" sacrifice, William being probably a "devil" of the witch-cult and Becket a Catharist heretic who at least in popular estimation held a similar position; both apparently met their deaths wittingly, in fulfilment of their "religious" obligations. This thesis is worked out with great ingenuity in an essay that never fails to be both interesting and provocative. There is, I think, some special pleading, and neither the author himself nor Dr Demant, whose preface is both judicious and profound, would claim that the case is fully established—indeed, Dr Demant remains obviously un-

convinced himself, particularly with regard to Becket. Nevertheless, Mr Williamson has assembled sufficient evidence to make the double affair look decidedly suspicious and to prepare the way for further investigation. More important than the ostensible thesis is the general treatment of "comparative religion" which it involves. The pagan origins of blood sacrifice and the death-resurrection *motif* are discussed, and the opposition and interaction of orthodox Christianity and the various forms of dualism brought out. Seen in brief outline, the amount of interaction is impressive, and when medieval Catholicism is studied, as it is here, in relation to the large pagan element in the common people and the strong forces of dualistic heresy both outside and within its own camp, we become more aware of its precarious tenure and realize afresh that its iron-clad system was in fact a sign of weakness. Mr Williamson makes no profession of scholarship, and his information is largely derived from secondary sources. I am incapable of criticizing either the detail relating to Rufus and Becket or the historical treatment of dualistic heresy, but it seems in principle somewhat dangerous to stress the similarities to be found among such various religious phenomena as Mithraism, Gnosticism, Manichæism, witchcraft, Catharism, and Albigensianism without dwelling at some length upon their differences. Of course, distinctions are drawn, but one has the impression that they are too softly shaded; I am not convinced of any important relationship between the witch-cult—decadent paganism gone "black"—and the Manichæan strain. Nor do I, with Mr Williamson (and Freud), find it "tempting to see in Moses one of Akhnaton's courtly followers who, after the king's death, kept alive his teaching among a band of captive Israelites whom, for this purpose, he led out of Egypt to a new land" (pp. 60-61). There is a chapter on "The Nature of Love" (relevant to the theme of Catholicism and dualism) which contains some praise of "Uranianism" —*i.e.*, homosexuality without physical perversion—as a mark of genius. "From Shakespeare's passion for 'Mr W. H.,'" it is asserted, "sprang certainly the sonnets and probably most of the plays" (p. 79). No authority is given for this remarkable statement, and no Shakespearean scholar that I know of would endorse it. There was a conventional highly-coloured language of friendship at the Renaissance, in which it was quite usual for poets to address their patrons; Shakespeare *may* have had some real affection for the young man to whom certain of the sonnets are addressed (if he were not imaginary, like so many characters in contemporary sonnet cycles); but there need not have been anything "homosexual" about it, and there is no evidence one way or another, except the presumptively negative evidence of the current conventions and the general tone of Shakespeare's treatment of love in the plays. To say that "the homosexual relationship is . . . the key to such plays as *The Merchant of Venice* and *Julius Cæsar*" and to *Othello* is quite fantastic; if such a relationship had been intended, it would, according to the conventions of the Elizabethan theatre, have been made abundantly clear in the dialogue. Tennyson's *In Memoriam* is also referred to as a homosexual poem—which is a pretty thorough evacuation of all meaning from the word; and in *Crossing*

the Bar, we are told, "the 'pilot' is not God but Arthur Hallam" (p. 81). I quote from the authorized biography of Tennyson by his son: "He explained the 'Pilot' as 'That Divine and Unseen Who is always guiding us' "—a somewhat extravagant description of Arthur Hallam. If in the matters of which I know something dubious authorities are followed and doubtful statements educed, may there not be similar faults in the main argument of the work? Yet, in spite of this hidden *gnosis* denied to the mere scholar and historian, Mr Williamson's book is undoubtedly worth reading in order to meet a lively and widely interested, if at times somewhat irritating, mind. It is pleasantly produced, but there are too many printer's errors.

CARDIFF. S. L. BETHELL.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES OF THE EAST. By Donald Attwater. Volume I: Churches in Communion with Rome. The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee. $4.00.

This is a thoroughly revised version of *The Catholic Eastern Churches*, first published in 1935. A volume on the Orthodox is to follow. Mr Attwater's object is to inform Latin Roman Catholics, especially in America, of the history, customs, and canonical status of immigrants of the Oriental rites, whether they are or are not in union with Rome. The presentation of complex historical problems is necessarily summary, but Mr Attwater is always fair, and if at times charity inhibits complete frankness, such charity extends to the Orthodox, whom he never accuses where the primary responsibility can be fastened on a political instead of a religious authority. In one place at least he seems to me to understate the claims of his co-religionists to represent in continuous succession the Church in the ancient Patriarchates. This is the curious case of Syria, where the Patriarchs received Jesuit missionaries and were recognized by them as ordinaries in the seventeenth century. There the Melkites did not finally divide into Melkites in communion with Rome and pro-Byzantine Orthodox until after 1724. The schism must ultimately be traced, not so much to Byzantine influence as to the unwisdom of the Crusaders in intruding a Latin Patriarch into the throne of Antioch.

It is the merit of Mr Attwater's book that he makes no attempt to conceal the quarrels and scandals that have often divided Eastern Roman Catholics not only from the Latins but from one another—for instance, feuds between Melkites and Maronites. Nor does he try, as some have done, to exculpate Rome from all blame. Schisms among the Armenians and the Chaldæans are in part attributed to the bull *Reversurus* (1867). Troubles among the Ukrainians in America were brought to a head by the Papal letter *Ea Semper* (1907), forbidding married clergy in the United States, where they seem to be a special source of scandal to the Irish. Knowing as he does the chequered history of the Ukrainians in Poland and America, Mr Attwater can be temperate in his judgments of recent events in Russia, where the arrest and deportation of the Catholic episcopate of the Byzantine rite

was followed by extensive defections to Orthodoxy. He does not blame the Orthodox Church.

Similar developments may be expected in Rumania and Hungary. Everywhere behind the iron curtain Roman Catholics are an object of suspicion to the secular authorities, as they were for similar reasons in Turkey in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Those of the Byzantine rite have much reason to feel that the generality of Latins regard them as third-class Catholics, and the generality of Orthodox as oppressed brethren who for mixed motives have submitted for the time being to the alien yoke of Rome. Transition to Orthodoxy is easy, and not uncommon. Should the present distribution of political power continue, the number of Roman Catholics belonging to Eastern rites is not unlikely to be halved. The loss is the more serious because the churches involved are the most genuinely autonomous and vital of the "Uniate" bodies. But from the wider Œcumenical viewpoint the situation has this advantage: that Roman Catholics interested in reunion, who are mainly concerned with the East, will be forced to recognize the futility of dealing with the Russian or any other considerable Eastern Church by the method of stimulating disputes in the hope of fissiparous action.

George Every, S.S.M.

Kelham.

Les Paradoxes du Bouddhisme. By Fr Taymans D'Eypernon, S.J. L'Edition Universelle, Bruxelles, 1947.

It is much to be desired that this admirable study of Buddhism should be translated into English. It is learned, in many ways original, and pervaded with a sweet charity by no means so common in a Christian or missionary study of a non-Christian faith. The Jesuit author has spent five years in Ceylon and has made many friends amongst the monks, in this way not only having an academic knowledge of the literary tradition, but—a very different matter—an understanding appreciation of the concrete Buddhism of today. He has come to the conclusion that the sincerity and good faith of the Buddhist have brought him nearer to our Lord than one would have thought.

The main body of the book deals with the paradoxical character of Buddhism—historical, doctrinal, and religious.

The amazing legend of the Buddha provides very little satisfaction for the critic, and it seems almost impossible to distinguish between myth and fact, yet there emerges one of the loveliest characters whom the world has seen. A doctrine apparently atheistic gives rise to a religion with a personal saviour, a galaxy of saints, and a richly complicated eschatology.

Fr D'Eypernon uses freely the vast corpus of Buddhist scriptures, and, indeed, begins his study with a valuable consideration of the problem of sources, comparing the Pali and the Sanskrit writings and trying to assess the value of Tibetan literature.

A section deals with the legend of the birth and life of the Buddha,

with an interesting section on Buddhist cosmology which has its own version of the doctrine of original sin.

A more difficult section of the book deals with the metaphysical and psychological aspect of Buddhist thought, and there follows a study of the many different schools of thought which cover attitudes as far removed from one another as Idealism and a form of Materialism. The crucial issue, of course, is the concept of Nirvana, and the various European scholars are reviewed and found wanting. Fr D'Eypernon does not believe that Nirvana in any sense implies annihilation, but rather transfiguration, after a process of ascetic detachment which may take more than one life to achieve.

The final section considers Buddhism as an actual religion. This makes it abundantly clear that Buddhist detachment does not produce a Puritan or still less a Manichæan denigration of matter and of creatures, but by a rich cultus develops an almost sacramental attitude; for the salvation offered by the Buddha embraces all things. The atheism of the Buddha is regarded as a reaction from the religious and philosophical implications of Brahmanism.

One has to accept the paradox that Buddhism originally is not a religion but a philosophy, and yet there is no thought more profoundly religious than the doctrine of the Buddha.

The Hinayana has no idea of grace, though its naturalism has been largely neutralized by the spontaneous devotion of the people. In the Mahayana or Great Vehicle the Buddhas have become legion, expressing the essence of pure Buddhahood. They are supermen who have achieved perfect wisdom and who reflect the cosmic soul. In later developments this conception leads to an emanationist theory of wisdom.

Buddhism has a very real sense of sin, at its best an exquisitely delicate moral code; no non-Christian faith has conceived of so high a standard, adumbrating the Evangelical Counsels. While in its metaphysics it has created many schools of thought, of which the most significant might be compared with the system of Spinoza in the West, a Japanese commentator finds affinities with the thought of Bergson, and, though Buddhism has permitted in the countries which it penetrated the continuance of ancient superstitions, and even in its earliest expression did not deny the Hindu pantheon, yet gods many and a superstitious fear of demons only provide a backcloth against which shines the glory of the Buddha and the hope of salvation through the Buddha, the law, and the community.

In a short review one cannot do justice to this profound and valuable work. Orientalists and all concerned with Eastern missions will be grateful to Fr D'Eypernon.

LEONARD M. SCHIFF.

SHEFFIELD.

The History of the Primitive Church: Vol. IV. By J. Lebreton, S.J., and J. Zeiller. Translated by E. C. Messenger. Burns Oates. 1948. 25s.

Dr Messenger has continued the good work. The present English volume contains a translation of the second half of the second French volume which was published in 1938 in the series edited by Fliche and Martin. The translation is readable, and the printing is clear. An occasional erratum from the French edition has remained in translation—*e.g.*, Singididunum for Singidunum on p. 1083, n. 1; a few additional misprints have appeared—*e.g.*, the misspelling of *légendes*, p. 896, n. 1; *perichoresis*, p. 900; *φιλαληθεῖς*, p. 1066, n. 2; 970 on p. 971, n. 2, should be 1017; on p. 822, n. 3, the genitive of Celsus has become an accusative; and there is an irritating habit of using the abbreviation *op. cit.* to send the reader chasing the reference far into an earlier volume. But the translator has more than compensated for a few oversights in proof by supplying the eminent defect of the French edition, an adequate index to the four volumes so far published.

The book describes the history of the Church from the middle of the third century until the edict of Galerius in 311. It includes essays upon Origen and his successors at Alexandria; upon the apocryphal gospels and the religious influences to be seen in them; upon Manichæanism (Lebreton was writing after the appearance of the first studies in the newly discovered papyri); upon Paul and Lucian of Samosata; upon the development of ecclesiastical organization; and upon the last persecution. The critical originality of Lebreton and the lucid exposition of both authors compel attention and invite agreement. In their pursuit of clarity they have failed to avoid the perils of a repetition implicit in their arrangement, but this is undoubtedly an important work of which any student of the third century must take account. For particular praise we should select the chapter on the apocryphal documents, though the reader is startled by the mildness of the judgment on the encratite beatitudes—"This ideal is clearly narrower than that of the beatitudes in the Gospel."

On points of detail there is room for disagreement. The more recent research of Courcelle suggests that the firmness with which this book places Commodian squarely in the third century is over-confident; the statement that "it was from the Meletian schism that Arianism arose and grew" is surely a shallow and misleading half-truth. The numbers which Eusebius gives for the Egyptian martyrs under the persecution of Diocletian are twice quoted as though they could be trusted, and one would sometimes welcome an air of hesitation about the validity of the evidence. Methodius is compelled to be bishop of Olympus even in the subtitle to a chapter, though another opinion is recognized in a footnote to be possible. The contrast between the view of the early Church which saw the Christian life in terms of a new birth, and the view of the Alexandrian fathers who saw it in terms of an ascent of a ladder towards perfection, is dismissed in a few lines as a "forced antithesis" (p. 809) without adequate evidence to support the dismissal: and thus the book glides lightly over a theo-

logical revolution which created the background for the earliest ascetical theology.

These minor criticisms do not detract from the service which the translator has rendered to the English reader in placing a valuable work of sound scholarship at his disposal. And Dr Messenger makes the welcome promise that we may expect more; indeed, it is pleasant to observe that more than a dozen footnotes of this volume are unintelligible until future volumes appear.

Owen Chadwick.

Trinity Hall,
Cambridge.

SHORTER NOTICES

Essential Education. By W. R. Niblett. University of London Press. 4s. 6d.

This book, the fourth in the series entitled "Educational Issues of Today," is a plea that we recognize what are the fundamental issues involved in the education of the child and adolescent. Dealing in the first chapter with the needs of the child, Professor Niblett calls us to bear in mind that real knowledge is something far greater than the amassing of factual information; it is rather a creative thing, the integration of intellect and emotion. The second chapter, entitled "The Escape from Laissez-Faire," is probably the best in the book. How true it is that the desire so often expressed "not to bias the child in matters of religion, faith, or patriotic feeling, or even in standards of manners and behaviour . . . is a product of an attitude to life, the attitude of a society which had lost or had ceased to trust many of the specific beliefs in which it had itself been brought up." Those of us who have experience of the value of art, music, and literature in the life of the school child will endorse the author's plea that a greater proportion of time should be given to these in the school curriculum; but the weakness of the book lies in the chapter on Religious Education, which tends to be frankly sentimental. There is too much about man's search for God (which is not the message of the Bible), too many phrases such as "some sudden awareness of the immensity of sea or sky," but too little about Revelation and the Church.

Altrincham. M. S. Dawson.

The Difficulty of Faith. By Douglas Stewart. S.C.M. Press. 3s. 6d.

This concise little book expresses clearly and often arrestingly much that needs saying, and should in particular prove helpful to leaders of study groups and others who are seeking to implement the report "Towards the Conversion of England." Inspired by a realization that the humanism which is characteristic of the present day is foreign to Christian thought, it is, as the author claims, "an essay in practical theology." It is right to be reminded yet again that the immediate situation dictates the manner and not the substance of the Church's

message. The changing emphasis of humanism in this and preceding centuries has shown the wisdom of the Church in refusing to bring herself up to date by embracing the so-called "modern thought" of any one age.

Faith is the response of man's entire personality to the Living God, and is to be found only by the removal of that which is preventing the natural flow of man's heart and mind to Him. The modern error is rightly described as the attempt to unite in one personality a Christian will with non-Christian thought and feeling, but man's nature cannot be divided.

The discussion of difficulties in the way of faith in the last three chapters should prove the most helpful part of the book. After examining the intellectual temper of our age, the author goes on to ask how Christian thinking begins in actual experience, and shows that to know God one must enter into relationship with Him. The emotional difficulties are the most troublesome. Men need the love of God as a "master sentiment" in their lives. This section of the book provides an effective answer to the advocates of "popular" services as the means of bringing people back to church, and to those who are accustomed to think of such problems only in terms of a simple decision of the will.

The Church today is "holding open the door of salvation," and it is "because the Church is acting, and acting in the name of God, that there is always a conflict between the sinful, unreconciled will of man and her challenge to him." Modern man wants to be a Christian in his own way, but resists the humiliation and surrender involved in membership of the Church.

K. E. H. Parkinson.

Bournemouth.

The Message of the Bible. By R. K. Orchard. Lutterworth Press. 5s.

This is a timely little book which it is to be hoped will be widely read by those undertaking the difficult task of giving "religious" instruction under the appropriate Agreed Syllabus.

The Education Act lays a great share of responsibility for the evangelization of our new pagan society on the young shoulders of teachers often ill-equipped to bear it, and who, however eagerly they may apply themselves to the task, cannot easily pick their way through the detail of a critical study of the Bible. These will be helped by a book which affirms that "the only really indispensable commentary on the Bible is the Bible," and goes on to tell us in eighty-six pages, simply and directly, with the prologue to the fourth Gospel as guide, just what the Bible is all about.

"The only really indispensable commentary on the Bible is the Bible." But its message comes to each generation with a different emphasis, and it has to be re-thought and translated into current vocabulary before it can be assimilated. This is the work of God the Holy Spirit, by whose activity the divine act in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ is "perpetually recalled, retold, re-enacted." This little book is not quite so simple as it seems. It is an introduction

to Biblical study in terms of the best thought of this generation, and its apparent simplicity is an achievement on which the learned author is much to be congratulated.

It follows that what the Bible has to say "can only be fully heard in the context of a rich churchmanship." But those of us who sometimes pray with rather heavy hearts that God will send workers into His vineyard will be grateful for the assurance that "the Holy Spirit can use for His ends honest and sincere Bible teaching outside the life of the church, if it is given by believers who are themselves rooted in the life of the church and constantly refreshed by it."

I am sorry Mr Orchard uses a small "c" for Church, sorry, too, that on p. 32 he uses the Authorized mistranslation of Rom. viii, 28. I believe he is mistaken in ascribing the lines on God's oddity to Hilaire Belloc, and I rather wish he had not given his blessing to one of the less satisfactory passages in Professor Dodd's great commentary on *Romans*. But these are trifles. Mr Orchard speaks admirably to our condition, and his wise and stimulating words should help many to teach the Bible as "Christian Scripture"—that is, as "not merely a record of history referring only to one historical situation," but to "see through the historical situation the mighty acts of God which find their culmination and final significance in Jesus Christ."

ORMSKIRK. M. BURDESS.

The Common-Sense Theology of Bishop White. Selected Essays from the writings of William White, 1748-1836, First Bishop of Pennsylvania and a Patriarch of the American Church, with an Introductory Survey of his theological position by Sydney A. Temple, Jr. King's Crown Press, Morningside Heights, New York. n.p.

Readers of Dr W. H. Stowe's delightful volume, *The Life and Letters of Bishop William White*, will be glad to read this careful study by Dr S. A. Temple, Jr, together with selections from the writings of the famous bishop. White's literary output, in the form chiefly of addresses, sermons, and episcopal charges, was considerable; but, judging by the selection before us, it does not appear to be of any outstanding importance. His claim to greatness lies rather in his long and vigorous episcopate, ruling as first bishop of Pennsylvania for nearly fifty years; his obtaining the English succession through his consecration and that of Samuel Provaost at the hands of the English archbishops, assisted by the bishops of Bath and Wells and of Peterborough; and the ability by which he planned and guided the organization of the American Church.

William White, little known in 1782 outside Philadelphia, where his pastoral work lay, sprang to fame overnight by his pamphlet *The Case of the Episcopal Church in the United States Considered*, which appeared on August 8th of that year. It marked him out at once as a leader in ecclesiastical circles. For a period much longer than one hundred years the government in the mother country had refused to allow bishops to be consecrated for the American Church, and White now

came forward with the plea that, since "the succession cannot at present be obtained," Presbyterian ordinations should now take place as a temporary measure. The effect of the pamphlet was immediate. The clergy of Connecticut gathered in secret session and despatched Samuel Seabury to England to seek consecration from the archbishops, and, if failure met them there, from the bishop of the Scottish Church. It is likely that White was not at this time convinced of the necessity of episcopal ordination, even if he changed his mind afterwards, as he may have done.

Dr Temple writes of William White as "a sacramentalist in the fullest meaning of that term," of the school of Burnet and Tillotson. White regards baptism as "a putting into a state of grace or covenant with God," a being begotten into immortality. The Eucharist is for him but a memorial, yet it is a unique, effective and unifying act, bringing us into relation with God and with one another. The bishop disliked such terms as priest, altar and sacrifice. He rather quaintly warns students in theology against the use of them, with the thought of the "enormous corruptions" to which they have given rise.

We are grateful to Dr Temple for an interesting and stimulating book. It is beautifully produced. A second edition should be provided with an index. The fine portrait of Dr White in the vestry of St Peter's Church, Philadelphia, reproduced as a frontispiece, is curiously unlike portraits of the bishop hitherto published. The artist is said to be unknown.

R. D. Middleton.

St Margaret's Vicarage,
Oxford.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Hardman is Chaplain of St Monica's House, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol.

Dr Wilson is Manager of a Research Laboratory in Birmingham and a Diocesan Lay Reader.

Mr Boycott is a farmer and a Lay Reader at All Saints, Kemble, Glos.

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher